



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

our eyes to the context, He leaves us in no doubt as to who that shepherd is. "I am the good shepherd" (says our blessed Lord). "The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." And to make it still more emphatic, He repeats, "I am the good shepherd; and I know mine, and mine know Me. And other sheep I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd" (Douay Bible, John x. 11-16). To assert, therefore, that our Lord meant that St. Peter was to be the "one shepherd" does seem startling, as almost directly contradicting the very words of Christ Himself.

Our correspondent says the whole doctrine of the Pope's supremacy is contained in these two articles: First, "Christ having declared that there should be 'but one shepherd and one fold,' actually made St. Peter His *terrestrial shepherd*" (a phrase nowhere to be found, we believe, either in Holy Scripture or the Fathers); and secondly, That this *office*, according to Christ's institution, was, after Peter's decease, to pass to his successors, who were no other than the bishops of Rome.

If the first proposition fails, the second becomes impossible. Where there is no peculiar office created, there can be no successors in it. We have in former articles shown at large that it is a mere fanciful assertion to say that to exhort Peter to feed the flock was appointing him to an "office," or anything else than merely stimulating him to the performance of duties, to which he, with the rest of the Apostles, had already been appointed; and that such was clearly the view of the most eminent fathers of the Church whom we there referred to. We respectfully solicit our correspondent's attention to the article in our February 1857 number (pp. 17, 18), and shall gladly insert anything he may write to show that we have fallen into error, or been guilty of misrepresentation as to any of the authorities there referred to.

We cannot agree with our correspondent that the inquiry whether St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome is to him an unimportant one, unless, indeed, it were clear that by divine institution St. Peter held a third character, distinct from both the Episcopate and Apostleship, capable of being transferred to his successors, which we respectfully challenge our correspondent to prove. To us, indeed, it is not at all necessary to deny that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, as we have shown in one of the articles referred to by Dr. Geraghty (Oct., 1856, vol. v., p. 112); but to the advocate of Papal power it appears to be indispensable to prove that St. Peter was in the strictest sense of the term *Bishop of Rome*; for if St. Peter was not Bishop of Rome, we know not how the bishops of Rome could be his successors, as it is not pretended that he had any successors in his *Apostleship*; and yet, according to Dr. Geraghty's own second proposition, it was "by Christ's institution to pass to his successors, who were no other than the bishops of Rome," and, of course, therefore, of necessity as bishops of Rome.

Our correspondent, however, while representing the inquiry as an unimportant one, and leaving, we think, wholly unanswered the arguments and authorities contained in the article in question, which he somewhat contemptuously disposes of as being merely "zealous wishes and conjectures," proceeds to cite a number of passages from the fathers, nearly all of which have already been fully dealt with in our pages, and which, therefore, we cannot undertake to go into at large again in our present observations.

We shall try, however, as far as our limited space will admit, to put our readers in the way of judging of the real value of the testimonies cited, some of which, until fully examined, we admit afford some colour for our correspondent's use of them.

The passage from *Irenæus* has already been so often discussed in our pages that we need only refer to what we have before said in vol. ii., p. 100, and vol. iv., p. 33, where we have given the exact words of the old Latin translation (the Greek words being unfortunately lost), and where our readers will also find what we believe to be the correct interpretation of it. As to the alleged comment of Salmasius, we pass it by, as we do not in any way recognise his authority on such a question.

The passage from *Tertullian* is also given by us in full in our second volume, page 100, and vol. iv., page 33, and it will be there seen bears a very different construction from that put on it by Dr. Geraghty. That Tertullian did not recognise any divine right in the Bishop of Rome as successor of St. Peter is plain also from another passage, in which he thus addresses the Roman Bishop, Zephyrinus—"But now from your own argument I ask, from whence you usurp this right of the Church? If from our Lord's saying to Peter, 'Upon this rock I will build my Church; to thee I have given the keys of the kingdom of heaven; or, whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound or loosed in heaven;' dost thou, therefore, presume this power of loosing and binding to have descended to thee?—that is, to the whole Church which is related to Peter. Who are thou, thus overturning and changing the manifest

intention of our Lord, who conferred this on Peter personally?"

That we have neither necessity nor disposition to "hush up" the writings of St. Cyprian will, perhaps, be admitted on reading the article in our present number on the Church of Africa, which was in type before we received Dr. Geraghty's letter. For the present, to bring what we have to say within readable limits, we must omit going further into the writings of this father, but before we have done with St. Cyprian's writings, we undertake not to omit any of the passages referred to by Dr. Geraghty.

Next in importance, perhaps, is the well known quotation from St. Jerome's epistle to Pope Damasus, which doubtless shows that St. Jerome entertained great respect for Damasus, as a successor of St. Peter, as well as a laudable anxiety to preserve the unity of the Catholic Church, of which Rome was then, undoubtedly, from its position and character, one of the chief supports. To form, however, a just opinion, either of the true sentiments of St. Jerome or of his weight as an impartial witness in the controversy, we must not only look to his personal history and character, but consider other passages in his undoubted writings, which prove clearly that he neither considered the Church as founded on St. Peter alone, nor believed the bishop of Rome to be the only successor of that Apostle. But as this is a subject which would obviously require more space than it would here be possible to bestow upon it, we shall reserve what we have to say for a distinct article in our next number.

Our correspondent's next quotations, in point of date, are from the work of *Optatus* against the Donatists, at the latter end of the 4th century, and the passage cited from his second book (if not corrupted) shows, no doubt, that he thought Linus succeeded St. Peter in the See of Rome, and that St. Peter had himself exercised the *episcopal office*.¹ In this, however, *Optatus* is contradicted by still more ancient testimony, viz., among others, the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which, though not now recognised as actually written by the Apostles, are by all parties considered to be not later than the 3rd century; and also by St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, already referred to, who wrote at the end of the 2nd century, both of whom speak of Linus as the first Bishop, as does also the most eminent ecclesiastical historian Eusebius. Valesius (a very learned Roman Catholic), in his Commentary on Eusebius, says the Apostles had a rank peculiar to themselves, *nor were they ever ranked among the Bishops of the Churches*.² The passage cited from St. Augustine says nothing whatever of the capacity in which St. Peter "sat" in the Church of Rome, and so far from referring *exclusively* to the Church of Rome as the centre of Catholic unity, he joins it expressly with the Church of Jerusalem, as will appear by giving the passage more fully:—"But," says he, "if all throughout the world were such as you vainly accuse them of being, what has the Church of Rome done to you, in which Peter sat and now sits, or the Church of Jerusalem, in which James sat and in which John now sits, with whom we are connected in Catholic unity, and from whom you are separated by your wicked madness."³

What was alone important to St. Augustine's argument evidently was, that the Churches of Rome, Jerusalem, &c., were founded by the Apostles, and were traceable up to their time in uninterrupted succession; but it had nothing to say to the question now at issue—namely, whether St. Peter had any such authority over the other Apostles as could give his successors a similar authority over their successors. That St. Augustine did not hold any such supremacy appears clear from many other passages in his writings, several of which we collected in one of the articles referred to (December 1856, p. 136). The very passage cited by Dr. G., in which St. Augustine speaks of St. Cyprian differing with Pope Stephen,⁴ seems to show in itself that he deemed the supreme authority to reside, *not* in the Bishop of Rome as St. Peter's successor, but in a *General Council*, to which he rightly says "St. Cyprian would have surrendered his opinion," though he stoutly maintained it in spite of Pope Stephen's anathemas and threats of excommunication. Will Dr. Geraghty tell us frankly in his next communication whether he considers the supreme authority in matters of faith to be the Pope or a General Council? We only impeached the supremacy of the Pope, and Dr. G. appears to deal with St. Augustine's reference to a *General Council* as a testimony against us. We confess we think that St. Augustine's testimony, in that passage at least, makes against, not for, Dr. Geraghty's argument.

If our correspondent will carefully read the articles in question he will see that we never denied that St. Peter may have been at Rome, and exercised for a time ecclesiastical authority there, and, therefore, in a certain sense, acted as Bishop of Rome, just as St. Paul also did, by virtue of his apostolical office, and just as Peter himself did also at

Antioch and elsewhere. All we said was, that neither St. Peter nor St. Paul were ever, in that *accurate* and *local* sense, Bishops of Rome, which alone could support the claims of the Bishops of that Church to be considered exclusively as St. Peter's successors. We also there showed that it was plain that in whatever sense St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, St. Paul was also Bishop of Rome, and that neither of them was Bishop of Rome in any such sense as would prevent another bishop also being *contemporaneously* Bishop of Rome, as it was plain from ecclesiastical history that there were several such bishops (at least two—viz., Linus and Clemens) during the lifetime of St. Peter himself, who was, therefore, no more Bishop of Rome at his death than he was Bishop of Antioch at that period. As to what Dr. Geraghty says, that the popes would not have lost an iota of their title to be St. Peter's successors if St. Peter had expired immediately after the words "rule or feed my sheep" were addressed to him by our Lord at Jerusalem, we confess we are unable to understand what our learned correspondent means; for what Rome could have had to say to St. Peter in such a case we are utterly at a loss to imagine. The question is not what they would or would not have lost, but how the Bishops of Rome could have ever gained such title, if St. Peter had expired before he ever set foot in Rome, or had any connection with it whatsoever, which is the case supposed by Dr. Geraghty. Perhaps Dr. G. will be kind enough to explain himself a little more fully on this point, if he should do us the favour to write to us again.

As to the quotations from Leo I. and Gregory I., both Bishops of Rome themselves, we must beg leave to demur to allowing them to be witnesses in *their own favour*: admissions against their own interest are, of course, another matter. We look upon Popes Leo and Gregory I. as among the most able and determined aggressors on the freedom of the Church to be found before the era of Pope Hildebrand, in whose time the Papacy attained its climax of power; and we gave a specimen of Pope Gregory's attempts to encroach upon the liberties of the Church of Aquileia, in an article entitled "the Church of Italy," in our number for October last (vol. vi., p. 112), to which we would respectfully also call the attention of our correspondent.

Upon the alleged confirmation of Rome's spiritual supremacy by General Councils and the Emperor Justinian, we shall have something to say hereafter, but for the present shall only observe, that if the Bishops of Rome had such pre-eminence by *divine right* and *Christ's own institution*, it is somewhat strange that they should need human confirmation, or think they could derive any corroboration from the decrees of Councils or a Roman Emperor.

The passage in St. Chrysostom referred to as taken from vol. v., hom. 12, we have searched for in vain both in the Savil and the Benedictine editions. Will Dr. G. in future be good enough to give us the page and edition he cites from. If he wishes to be of use to our Roman Catholic readers, or to influence Protestant ones, it is obviously essential that the verification of his authorities should be made as easy as possible. He must admit that we set him a good example in that particular at least, if in no other.

The meaning of St. Ambrose when he says, "Wherever Peter is, there is the Church," is best explained, we think, by other passages in which he says, "Faith is the foundation of the Church. For it is not said of the *body*, but of the *faith* of Peter, that the gates of hell shall not prevail over him." And again, "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that you may bind and loose. What is said to Peter is said to the Apostles."⁵

We have only now to express our surprise that our correspondent should have alluded to the case of Pope Victor and his threatened excommunication of the Churches which would not conform to his regulations about keeping Easter. So far from yielding to his threats, they refused to change their customs, and St. Irenæus (the self-same Irenæus whom Dr. Geraghty represents as having laid it down as *necessary* that every other Church should coincide with that of Rome, instead of taking part against the Asiatic Churches) wrote Victor a letter of exhortation, strongly remonstrating with him for breaking the peace of the Church in such a matter.⁶ We are prevented by want of space from giving a more full account of this instructive incident, but shall, probably, return to it again at an early period, should our space permit, in a future number.

WHAT IS TRADITION?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR,—The next time we met for discussion the Reader says to Andy, "I'm going to be at the second part of your rule to-night—we'll take a shot at *tradition*." "Fire away," says Andy, "and do your best." "Before we begin," says the Reader, "I must remark that you often take an advantage of us by using the word 'tradition' in two different senses. You sometimes use it to mean the doctrine handed down, and sometimes the way of handing down the doctrine. But you might just

¹ Ambrose de incarnatione Dom. c. 5. Op. tom. ii. p. 711, Ben. Ed. 1666.

² Idem in Psalm 58. Op. tom. i. p. 858. Ben. Ed.

³ See Dupin's Eccl. Hist., vol. I, p. 76, Dublin Ed.; and Eusebius's Eccl. Hist., lib. v., c. 22-23.

⁴ Salmasius is anything but an authority among Protestants. The character given of him in Rees's Cyclopædia, vol. xxii., is, that he was "learned, but inaccurate; rather a receptacle of erudition than an able dispenser of it."

⁵ "De tua nunc sententia quero, unde hoc jus ecclesiæ usurpes? Idecirco præsuntis et ad te derivassis solvendi et alligandi potestatem, id est ad omnem ecclesiæ Petri propinquam; quails es eventus atque commutatus manifestam Domini intentionem personaliter hoc Petro conferentem."—Tertull. de Pud., § xli., xxii., p. 743. Rigalt. Ed., Paris 1634.

⁶ The other passage cited from Optatus is from the 7th book, which is undoubtedly spurious. To omit other grounds, it is enough to say that Optatus himself tells us his work was in 6 books only.

⁷ Valesius in Eusebium lib. iii., c. 14 and 21. Notes, pp. 43 and 45.—Amstelod., 1695.

⁸ August., Oper. tom. ix., p. 254, c. li., n. 118.

⁹ Ibid., tom. ix., p. 28, lib. ii., c. 2, n. 6. De Baptismo.

as well call a horse and the sack of corn that he carries by the one name." "That wouldn't do at all," says Mick; "for the horse that carries the corn is one thing, and the corn that's carried is another." "Just so," says the Reader; "and, in like manner, the doctrine that's handed down is one thing, and the means by which it is handed down is another." "Well," says Andy, "I allow that it would be clearer if we had different words; but we can examine each meaning separately. First and foremost," says he, "I'll defend unwritten tradition as a means of handing down doctrines." "Tell me," says the Reader, "what do you mean by unwritten tradition?" "I mean," says Andy, "one man telling a doctrine to another, and he telling it to a third, and he to a fourth, and so on for hundreds of years." "Well," says the Reader, "I can't think that a safe way, and, what's more, I don't think you'd trust to it yourself in worldly matters. Would you be satisfied with that kind of lease for your farm?" "He wouldn't so," says Mick; "and it's himself that paid a pound for a regular written lease, though there were half a dozen present when the master promised him the ground." "He showed his sense," says the Reader. "A written lease is better than any unwritten tradition; and I only wish he was as cautious about his religion as about his farm." "Why, then," says Mick, "isn't it a queer thing entirely that we're more particular about the security for our ground than for our souls, and that we trust our salvation on a security that we wouldn't trust an acre of land?" "That's all very fine talk," says Andy; "but I've facts against you that are worth more than all your arguments. Tell me," says he, "wasn't it unwritten tradition the people had to trust to from the time of Adam to Moses? and if religion could be handed down by word of mouth for 2400, why couldn't it be handed down in the same way for 1800 years?" "Well," says the Reader, (1) "even granting all you ask, that's nothing to us in the present day. The people then hadn't Scripture, so they should only do the best they could without it; but that's no reason why we should trust our religion now to unwritten tradition, when we have the written word of God in our hands. You might just as well say that because Adam and Eve wore fig-leaves for clothes I ought to throw away my good frieze coat and dress myself in fig leaves." "Pon my word, you'd be a nice looking animal if you did that," says Mick. "I'm thinking the people would run from you." "But," says the Reader, "I wouldn't be a bit more foolish than what Andy wants us to do. Adam and Eve did with fig leaves for clothes because at the time they had no better; and in old times the people trusted to tradition for handing down doctrines because they had no other means of preserving them. But is that any reason why we should trust to it now, when we've God's written word for our guide. But I'll show you besides (2) that the two cases which you've compared aren't at all alike. 'Twas much easier to hand down a doctrine then by word of mouth than now." "How do you make that out?" says Andy. "Why," says the Reader, "I suppose you'll allow that the fewer hands a story passes through the better chance it has of coming down correct." "There's no denying that," says he. "Well, then," says the Reader, "the long lives the people enjoyed in those days gave them an advantage that we haven't—five or six persons could hand down a doctrine from Adam to Moses; but 'twould take forty or fifty to hand down a doctrine from Christ to us; and besides," (3) says the Reader, "the people weren't left entirely to tradition from Adam to Moses." "What else had they?" says Andy. "They had repeated revelations from God,¹ which helped to keep the doctrines in remembrance. And, moreover, (4) I don't think you could have made a worse defence for unwritten tradition than the very facts you refer to. See how the faith was corrupted in handing down, and the worship of the one true God degenerated into the worship of idols." Thus, with all the helps which unwritten tradition then had (helps which it couldn't have in later days), it failed in handing down correctly the doctrines of religion." "Sure," says Mick, "we all know it to be a fact that no two persons tell a story exactly alike, and it's a purty story 'twould be after passing through forty or fifty people, for 1800 years." "I'm thinking," says Jerry, "that in the end 'twould be like the story of the three black crows. Once upon a time a decent man was going the road, and he was surprised to see the neighbours looking after him as if he had seven heads, and he couldn't tell at all what was the matter. At last he heard one of them saying to another, 'There's the man that eat the three black crows for his dinner.' So you may be sure the honest man was greatly vexed at having his character taken away in that manner, and says he, 'If you don't tell me at once who set that story going, may I never but I'll swear agin you for defamyation.' So with that they told him, and went straight to the man, and says he, 'Wasn't it a shame for you to go tell the neighbours that I eat three black crows, when you know well that I wouldn't take a pound note and eat one of the dirty beasts.' 'I never said so,' says the man; 'I only said that you eat two black crows, and them bliggards exaggerated, and made it three.' 'But who told you such a story at all, at all?' says the man. 'Such a one in the

next parish," says he. So the decent man went to the other fellow, and, says he, 'Isn't it a burning shame to have you setting a report through the country that I eat two black crows, and to have man and mother's son laughing at me whenever I show my nose.' 'I never said such a thing,' says he; 'I only said that you eat one black crow; and if you want any satisfaction you may go to my father's brother's son, for 'twas he that told me.' So the poor man went to him, and says he, 'What did I ever do to you that you should make a hare of me through the parish, by saying that I eat a filthy black crow for my dinner?' 'I never said it at all,' says he; 'I only said that you had a fine turkey-cock, as black as a crow, that I supposed you'd be eating at Christmas.' So, my dear, there's the story of the three black crows." "And a very good instance it is," says the Reader, "of the danger of trusting to unwritten tradition. Not one of you," says he, "would trust to it in the common affairs of life, and isn't it a queer thing to trust to it in the most important matter of all, the salvation of your souls." "But," says Andy, "you're speaking of stories handed down by sinful laymen, that are liable to mistakes and errors; but the handing down that I speak of is done, as Dr. Milner tells us,² by holy priests and bishops, that can't go wrong." "Stop," says Mick, "he must be wrong there; for the poor man's catechism tells us that the traditions are delivered 'from father to son';³ and as the priests can't be fathers, sure they can't have sons." "Well," says the Reader, "that's a funny argument, anyhow; and maybe it's yourselves that have the traditions after all." But the boys declared that they hadn't a single tradition to hand down to their sons. "And, by my word," says Mick, "I'd rather hand down a five pound note if I could; for I think 'twould do the creatures more good." "But," says the Reader, "I've another argument (5) against the idea that we're to trust to unwritten tradition for the doctrines of our religion. God Himself saw fit to write the ten commandments, and ordered Moses to write down the other precepts of the law, and He inspired Prophets and Apostles to write the rest of the Bible; and why do you think He did so?" "I suppose," says Mick, "because He saw that 'twas needful." "It couldn't be that," says Andy; "for Dr. Milner says that the Christian religion could have been preserved without the Bible being written at all."⁴ "So he does," says the Reader; "but don't you think that's as much as saying that God did a very needless work when He inspired men to write the Bible?" "Indeed," says Mick, "it looks very like it; but for all," says he, "I think God knew what was needful for us better than Dr. Milner." "Besides," says the Reader, "that's a foolish kind of argument. If God pleased He could have made us with but one leg each; and, in like manner, He could have left us depending on unwritten tradition. But He hasn't done either of these things: He has given us two good legs to make use of, and He has given us His written word to guide us; and we might just as well tie up one leg and hobble about on the other as trust to unwritten tradition while we have the written word of God." "I don't think St. Peter thought much of it," says Jerry; "for when he felt his end approaching he wrote his Epistle, and he says that he did so in order that 'after my decease also you may often have whereby you may keep a memory of these things.'⁵ Now, if unwritten tradition was as good as the written word he needn't have troubled himself with writing it." "There's no doubt about it," says Mick; "and we're only making fools of ourselves trying to prove that hearsay is as good evidence as writing. There's not one of us would trust to it for our farms, and why should we trust to it for our souls." "Well," says Andy, "I can afford to give up that point; for, after all, our traditions aren't unwritten stories floating about in that way. They're written down safe in the decrees of councils and in the writings of the fathers." "I see," says the Reader, "that you've shifted your ground, and you're now going to defend tradition, using the word to signify doctrines which you say were taught by Christ and His Apostles, but not to be found in the Bible." "Yes," says Andy, "we're more than 100 large volumes of them." "Maybe you'd bring them over some evening," says the Reader, "till we'd have a look at them." "Man alive," says Andy, "a coach and four wouldn't hold them; and, besides, they'd be no use to you, for they're all in Greek and Latin." "Have you got them at home?" says the Reader. "Is it laughing at me you are," says Andy; "sure they're worth thousands of pounds, and are only to be got in some of the great libraries, and do you think the likes of me would have them." "Has the priest got them?" says the Reader. "No, indeed," says Andy; "for if he had I'd have seen them." "And didn't you ever see the things you're talking so much about?" says the Reader. "Well," says Andy, "I allow that I never did see them, and I suppose I couldn't see them all nearer than Rome." "Well," says the Reader, "even on your own showing your traditions must be very useless things—they're in strange languages, so that no poor man could read them, and even if one was able to read them they're so long that one could hardly get through them in a lifetime; and, lastly, they're not to be had." "But," says Andy, "our priests are taught them,

and they teach them to us."⁶ "But," says the Reader, "I won't receive those stories as the Word of God, unless I'm given some proof of it." "Sure," says Andy, "what Christ or His Apostles spoke is as much the Word of God as what they wrote."⁷ "Yes," says the Reader, "and what we want is, for you to prove that they really did speak your traditions. If you prove that we'll believe them as firmly as if they were written in the Bible." "Sure," says Andy, "St. John says, 'Many other signs also did Jesus in the sight of His disciples which are not written in this book.'⁸ Now, doesn't that show that we must have recourse to tradition to make up for what the Bible has omitted?" "No," says the Reader; "for the very next verse says, 'But these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that, believing, you may have life in His name.'⁹ So that, instead of that verse proving the necessity of tradition, it proves that we don't want anything more than is in the word of God." "I see by that," says Mick, "that if traditions were in swarms forent us they wouldn't be wanted, for the Bible has enough in it for salvation." "That's just it," says the Reader. "We know that Christ did and said many things that aren't put down in the Bible; but when God has put down as much as is needful to instruct us unto salvation,¹⁰ and to give eternal life,¹¹ what more do we want?" "But," says Andy, "Dr. Milner tells us that St. Paul bid the people 'stand fast in the traditions.'¹² "That's true," says the Reader; "but does Dr. Milner tell us what those traditions were?" "No," says Andy, "he doesn't." "And can you tell us what they were?" says the Reader. "No, indeed," says Andy. "Then, isn't it a hard thing," says the Reader, "to ask us to believe things that you don't know anything about yourselves?" "But," says Andy, "I'm sure they're somewhere among the traditions; and if you received them all you'd have those amongst the lot." "That wouldn't do at all," says the Reader; "for even Dr. Milner admits that you have many 'fabulous traditions' amongst the number. So I won't swallow them all at a mouthful in that way." "But," says Jerry, "does Dr. Milner really say that some of our traditions are fabulous?" "Indeed he does," says the Reader. "There, you can look at it for yourself." "It's too true," says Jerry; "them's his very words." "But," says Andy, "St. John says that Christ did so many things that if they were all written down, 'the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.'¹³ Now all them things can't be in your little Bible; so you must have recourse to tradition for them." "Well," says the Reader, "if you tell me some of those things, and prove that Christ really said or did them, I'll believe them as firmly as if they were in my Bible." "That's fair," says Mick; "so bring forward some of Christ's sayings, and prove that He said it." "I allow that I couldn't do it," says Andy. "Then," says the Reader, "isn't it a hard thing to ask us to do what you can't do yourselves, and to believe we don't know what?" "But," says Andy, "St. Paul says in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, 'I wrote unto you in an epistle.'¹⁴ Now, where is that epistle?" "I don't know," says the Reader, "unless it's the first Epistle itself." "No," says Andy; "it refers to an epistle that isn't in the Bible at all." "Well," says the Reader, "produce it, and I'll receive it." So all the boys pressed forward to see Andy produce the new epistle, but not a bit of it was forthcoming. "What ails you at all?" says Mick. "Why don't you produce it?" "Well," says Andy, "the truth is, I haven't it." So the boys were mighty vexed, and says they, "You scheming vagabond what makes you be humbugging us in that way, talking about an epistle as if you had it in your pocket, and not knowing one bit about it all the time." "That shows us," says the Reader, "of how little use your traditions are—there's a whole epistle lost (according to Andy's account), and your traditions weren't able to save it. The short and the long of it is that we've no certainty of any traditions but the written traditions in the Bible. If you've others bring them forward, and prove them, and we'll receive them." "That's fair," says Mick, "and you couldn't ask more of any reasonable man." "Our blessed Lord," says Jerry, "seemed to be greatly against traditions. He said to the Jews, 'Why do you also transgress the commandments of God by your traditions?'¹⁵ and again, 'You have made void the commandments of God for your traditions.'¹⁶ "Yes," says the Reader, "and isn't it a remarkable thing that the only tradition that gained ground amongst the early Christians turned out to be a false one." Christ said one thing, and they added to it, until at last it became like the story of the three black crows." "But," says Andy, "sure the Bible speaks of traditions." "Yes," says the Reader, "and generally with disapprobation. But to set the matter at rest, bring forward a tradition and prove that Christ or the Apostles spoke it, and I'll receive it; but until you do that I'll stick to my Bible, and I'd advise you to do the same." "Tradition or no tradition," says Jerry, "one thing is plain, that the Bible by itself can 'instruct us unto salvation,'¹⁷ and what more do we want?" "True for you," says the boys; "what more do we want?" And so I says myself, Mr. Editor, what more do we want?

Your humble servant to command, DAN CARTHY.

¹ Milner's Letter, xl. Sec. 3.

² Gen. iii. 7.

³ Adam lived 930 years; Methuselah, 969; and Noah, 960.

⁴ To Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

⁵ Gen. xxi. 19. Josh. xxiv. 2.

⁶ End of Controversy, Letter xil.

⁷ Ninth Edition, page 11.

⁸ Letter x, sec. 3.

⁹ 2 Peter i. 15.

¹⁰ Milner's Letter, xil. ¹¹ Keenan, Chap. vi. Sec. 2. ¹² John xxi. 20.

¹³ II. Tim. iii. 16. ¹⁴ John xxi. 31. ¹⁵ II. Thess. ii. 14. ¹⁶ Letter 12.

¹⁷ John xxi. 25. ¹⁸ I. Cor. v. 9. ¹⁹ Matt. xv. 9. ²⁰ John xxi. 27, 28.

²¹ II. Tim. iii. 16.